

REMARKS

The present amendment and request for reconsideration is filed in response to the Office Action mailed December 8, 2006. Claims 1, 4-6, 10-11, and 20 are pending in the application.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Loney et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,137,517. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Nothing in the Loney et al. reference teaches or suggests a device for applying torque to a wire including a body portion having a U-shaped channel with an opening that extends along an entire length of the body portion, a tongue supported in the U-shaped channel including a first engagement surface positioned above a bottom surface of the U-shaped channel, a U-shaped slider that is longitudinally slidable within the channel of the body portion, the U-shaped slider having a closed end that forms a second engagement surface that receives a wire that is inserted into the channel and compresses the wire against the first engagement surface of the tongue so that rotation of the body portion applies torque to the wire. Because the Loney et al. reference does not disclose each and every element of Claim 1, it is submitted that the reference cannot anticipate Claim 1 or the claims that depend thereon.

With respect to Claim 10, applicants submit that the Loney et al. reference does not teach or suggest a wire torquing device comprising a body having a U-shaped channel extending along the entire length thereof in which a wire can be fitted and a slider that remains in the U-shaped channel as the wire is fitted along the length of the channel and is moveable longitudinally within the channel, the slider including an engagement surface that secures the wire as the slider is moved longitudinally in the channel.

As can be seen in Figures 1A-1C of the Loney et al. reference, the sliding member 16 must be removed from the device in order to secure the guidewire within the device and does not

meet the limitation that the slider remains in the U-shaped channel as a wire is fitted along the length of the channel. As such, it is submitted that Claim 10 and the claims that depend thereon are not anticipated by the reference.

Claims 2-4 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loney et al. in view of Hedger, U.S. Patent No. 4,057,186. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. With respect to Claims 2 and 3, the claims have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Claim 4 depends from and further defines Claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, Claim 4 is allowable for at least this reason.

With respect to Claim 11, applicants note that the claim depends from and further defines Claim 10, which is allowable. Therefore, Claim 11 is allowable for that reason.

Claims 7 and 8 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loney et al. in view of Sherts et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,533,772. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. With respect to Claims 7 and 8, these claims have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

With respect to Claim 20, applicants submit that the claim depends from and further defines Claim 10, which is believed to be allowable and is therefore allowable for at least this reason. In addition, applicants submit that neither reference cited by the Examiner teaches a U-shaped channel with a pair of sidewalls, a bottom surface and a fixed wedge positioned on one of the sidewalls of the U-shaped channel and a slider including an engagement surface that faces the wedge and is movable towards and away from the wedge to pinch the guide wire against the wedge. Because neither reference teaches or suggests at least this feature, the combination of references cannot render Claim 20 obvious and the rejection is in error.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loney et al. in view of Greive, U.S. Patent No. 6,059,484. Claim 9 has been cancelled, rendering the rejection moot.

In light of the above, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. It is therefore requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and pass this case to issue at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}



Brandon C. Stallman
Registration No. 46,468
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1708

RCT/BCS:pt

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100